



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

CONOCO PHILLIPS COMPANY  
600 NORTH DAIRY ASHFORD  
HOUSTON TX 77079-1175

**COPY MAILED**

**FEB 19 2008**

In re Application of :  
Beuke, et al. :  
Application No. 10/054,006 :  
Filing Date: 21 January, 2002 :  
Attorney Docket No. 001349.0238 :

This is a decision on the petition filed on 22 January, 2007, supplemented on 14 February, 2008, alleging unintentional delay under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

For the reasons set forth below, the petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

**BACKGROUND**

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the final Office action mailed on 13 January, 2005, with response due absent extension of time on or before 13 April, 2005;
- the application went abandoned after midnight 13 April, 2005;
- the Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 12 August, 2005;
- there appears to be considerable confusion in the file in that the Examiner mailed the 13 January, 2005, Office action while the application previously was abandoned with a petition was pending, and the decision on that matter seeming to have crossed in time with the 12 August, 2006, abandonment—thus producing uncertainty on the part of the Petitioner as to the status of the application;
- thereafter, on 22 January, 2007, Petitioner filed the instant petition with fee, the reply in the form of an after final amendment, which as one registered to practice before the

Office Petitioner is aware is not of right (and not a proper reply<sup>1</sup>), and made the statement of unintentional delay;

- the Examiner indicated that an after-final amendment would not be entered, and on 14 February, 2008, Petitioner supplemented the petition with a request for a continued examination (RCE) and fee, with a submission under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 in the form of an amendment (previously filed).

Petitioner will note that the availability of applications and application papers online to applicants/practitioners who diligently associate their Customer Number with the respective application(s) now provides an applicant/practitioner on-demand information as to events/transactions in an application

Out of an abundance of caution, Petitioners always are reminded that those registered to practice *and* all others who make representations before the Office must inquire into the underlying facts of representations made to the Office and support averments with the appropriate documentation—since all owe to the Office the continuing duty to disclose.<sup>2</sup>

### STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).<sup>3</sup>

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A proper reply is a an amendment *prima facie* placing the application in condition for allowance, a Notice of Appeal, or an RCE (with fee and submission). (See: MPEP §711.03(c).)

<sup>2</sup> See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office).

See, specifically, the regulations at 37 C.F.R. §10.18.

<sup>3</sup> 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

**35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.**

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

<sup>4</sup> Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.<sup>5</sup> Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).<sup>6</sup> And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.<sup>7</sup> Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.<sup>8</sup>)

The requirements for a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee, a showing of unintentional delay, a proper reply, and—where appropriate--a terminal disclaimer and fee.

It appears that Petitioner has satisfied the requirements of the regulation.

### CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is granted.

The instant application is released to Technology Center/AU 1724 for further processing in due course.

While telephone inquiries regarding this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214, it is noted that all practice before the Office is in writing (see: 37 C.F.R. §1.2<sup>9</sup>) and the proper authority for action on any matter in this regard are the statutes (35 U.S.C.), regulations (37 C.F.R.) and the commentary on policy (MPEP). Therefore, no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's action(s).

John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

<sup>5</sup> See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>6</sup> See: In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

<sup>7</sup> See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

<sup>8</sup> Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

<sup>9</sup> The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.2 provide:

**§1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.**

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.